<div align="center">REMARKS</div>

DRAWINGS

Applicant has noticed that the Examiner has not indicated in the Office Action Summary (PTOL-326) whether the submitted drawings have been accepted. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate whether the drawings submitted on the filing date of the present Application were accepted or objected to by the Examiner.

NEW GROUND(S) OF REJECTION

On page 13 of the Office Action (dated November 27, 2007), the Examiner states that "Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a)." Applicant respectfully disagrees, since the Applicant did not make any amendments to the claims in the previous Response. Applicant requests the Examiner to verify that all pending claims are original claims. Since the Examiner has improperly added new ground(s) of rejection (new arguments) to the Office Action (dated November 27, 2007), these new ground(s) of rejection should not be admitted or considered in the examination of this case. Otherwise, the Examiner should reopen prosecution of the present Application. Applicant requests the Examiner to refer to the MPEP at 706.07(a) which states: "Under present practice, second or any subsequent actions on the merits shall be final, except where the examiner introduces a new ground of rejection that is neither necessitated by applicant's amendment of the claims, nor based on information submitted in an information disclosure statement filed during the period set forth in

37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p)." Thus, the final Office Action should be changed to a non-final Office Action.

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) AND 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (PAGES 2-11 OF FINAL OFFICE ACTION)

With regard to the rejections for the pending claims, as presented in the final Office Action, at pages 2-11, the Examiner has restated the same remarks/arguments that were made in the non-final Office Action mailed on May 31, 2007. Therefore, the Applicant requests the Examiner to refer to Applicant's Response, dated August 31, 2007, as the Applicant stands by the arguments provided in this Response. Furthermore, the Applicant maintains that the pending claims are allowable for at least the reasons stated in the current Response, as detailed in the following section, Applicant's Response to Examiner's New Arguments.

Consequently, the Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims should be advanced to allowance.

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S NEW ARGUMENTS

On pages 11-13 of the Office Action (dated November 27, 2007), the Examiner has brought up some new arguments with respect to the pending claims.

With respect to independent Claim 7, the Examiner states:

> Regarding Claim 7, Examiner understands initiating a conference call as a method of adding new personal [sic] (stated as parties [sic]) to existing conference call(s), which could include parties from another existing conference calls. In further proof to show Ludwig can have multiple conference calls coexisting and not just single conference calls. [sic] Ludwig states "it will be apparent how a

conference call may be provided for additional parties, as well as simultaneously occurring conference calls"; Column 25 line 3-6. Ludwig also states "The Expert puts his three-party videoconference on hold (merely by clicking the HOLD button in video window 203) and accepts (via the ACCEPT button of New Call window 234) the urgent call from his boss, which results in the Expert being added to the boss' three-party videoconference call." Column 37 line 52-57. This shows once again multiple conference calls and participant(s) from one conference call being included into another conference call.

Claim 7 recites "A method of configuring side conference calls comprising: selecting one or more participant identifiers from at least one existing conference call; and positioning said selected participant identifiers into at least one side conference call identifier." The Examiner references Ludwig (US Patent No. 5,758,079), at Column 25, lines 3-6, which states:

> However, from this description it will be apparent how a conference call may be provided for additional parties, as well as simultaneously occurring conference calls.

The foregoing passage does not teach "selecting one or more participant identifiers from at least one existing conference call," as recited in Claim 7. Nor does the foregoing passage teach "positioning said selected participant identifiers into at least one side conference call identifier," as recited in Claim 7. Furthermore, the Applicant respectfully submits that "selecting one or more participant identifiers" as recited in Claim 7 is not disclosed in Ludwig. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the Office Action does not show a teaching of what is recited in Claim 7. The Examiner further references Ludwig, at Column 37, lines 52-57, which states:

The Expert puts his three-party videoconference on hold (merely by clicking the HOLD button in video window 203) and accepts (via the ACCEPT button of New Call window 234) the urgent call from his boss, which results in the Expert being added to the boss' three-party videoconference call.

Similarly, the foregoing passage does not teach "selecting one or more participant identifiers from at least one existing conference call," as recited in Claim 7. Nor does the foregoing passage teach "positioning said selected participant identifiers into at least one side conference call identifier," as recited in Claim 7. Furthermore, the Applicant respectfully submits that neither "selecting one or more participant identifiers" nor the term "identifier(s)" as recited in Claim 7 is disclosed in Ludwig. Applicant requests the Examiner to review the Specification, at paragraph [27], for example, which describes the term "participant identifier", as recited in Claim 7:

> One or more participants participating in a conference call may be displayed over one or more windows provided by a graphical user interface. Each participant may be identified by way of a participant identifier. The participant identifier may comprise a software object that incorporates a participant's name, icon, logo, or other unique insignia in order to adequately identify the participant in a conference call. The participant identifiers may be arranged as a list of participants grouped together. As discussed later, the participant identifiers may be listed under a particular conference identifier, signifying the conference call they are participating in. It is contemplated that the participant identifiers may be listed in a roll call fashion, where participants are listed in the order they call in or log in to the audio/video conferencing system.

Clearly, the Office Action does not show a teaching of a "participant identifier" as recited in Claim 7. Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, the Office Action does not show a teaching of what is recited in Claim 7.

While the Examiner alleges that "This shows once again multiple conference calls and participant(s) from one conference call being included into another conference call," Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not shown a teaching of "selecting one or more participant identifiers" as recited in the first clause of Claim 7, for example. Nor has the Examiner shown a teaching of "positioning said selected participant identifiers into at least one side conference call identifier," as recited in the second clause of Claim 7. Thus, for each of the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 7 contains patentable subject matter. Applicant believes that Claim 7 and its associated dependent claims should be allowed.

With regard to independent Claim 11, the Examiner states:

> Regarding claim 11, Examiner respectfully believes referring to conference identifier Luwdig teaches this. [sic] By Ludwig disclosing once [sic] the user elects to initiate a collaborative session, he she [sic] selects one or more desired participants by for example, clicking on that name to select the desired participant from the system rolodex or a personal rolodex, or by clicking on that name to select the desired participant from the system rolodex or a personal rolodex; Column 19 line 6-9. A collaborative session is considered to be a conference identifier. Further in drawings there are figures of conference identifiers, figure 38 element 203, 230, 234.

Claim 11 recites "A method of configuring one or more conference calls comprising: creating conference identifiers; and grouping participant identifiers into said conference identifiers." Ludwig, at Col. 19, lines 6-9 states:

> Once the user elects to initiate a collaborative session, he or she selects one or more desired participants by, for example, clicking on that name to select the desired participant from the system rolodex or a personal rolodex, or by clicking on the quick-dial button for that participant (see, e.g., FIG. 2A).

Nowhere does Ludwig, at Col. 19, lines 6-9 disclose anything about a "conference identifier" as recited in Claim 11. Instead, Ludwig discloses initiating a collaborative session by way of clicking on a name identifier to select the desired participant from a system rolodex or a personal rolodex. Furthermore, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner that "a collaborative session is considered to be a conference identifier." Applicant respectfully submits that a collaborative session (e.g., a video conferencing session) is clearly not a "conference *identifier*" as recited in Claim 11 (emphasis denoted in italics). Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has improperly characterized the term "conference identifier," as recited in the first clause of Claim 11. The Applicant requests the Examiner to review the Specification, at Figures 3 and 4. Further, the Applicant requests the Examiner to review the Specification, at paragraph [34], for example, which clearly describes the term "conference identifier," as recited in Claim 11:

> Each conference call may be identified by way of a conference identifier. The conference identifier may comprise a software object that incorporates a conference call name. The conference identifier may comprise a software object

that may incorporate a unique icon, logo, or other unique insignia. The graphical user interface may provide a default mode in which the first conference call identified by conference identifier #1 is provided as the audio and/or video feed...

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner does not show a teaching of what is recited in Claim 11. Consequently, Claim 11 should be passed to allowance.

Furthermore, the Examiner has stated that "Further in drawings there are figures of conference identifiers, figure 38 element 203, 230, 234."

On the contrary, Ludwig, at Col. 37, lines 42-43, describes element 203 of Figure 38 as a "video window." Clearly, a "video window" does not teach a "conference identifier," as recited in Claim 11. Consequently, for this reason alone, the Examiner does not show a teaching of the term "conference identifiers," as recited in Claim 11.

Ludwig, at Col. 38, lines 23-25, describes element 230 of Figure 38 as follows:

He then reinitiates (by selecting *deferred call indicator* 230, shown in FIG. 40) his deferred call with field representative 201 and his client 202, as shown in FIG. 41.

Thus, a "deferred call indicator" does not teach "conference identifiers," as recited in Claim 11. Consequently, for this reason alone, the Examiner does not show a teaching of the term "conference identifiers," as recited in Claim 11.

Furthermore, Ludwig discloses that element 234 is a "new call window," which is different from a "conference identifier," as recited in Claim 11. Therefore, for at least this

reason, the Office Action does not show a teaching of "conference identifiers," as recited in

Claim 11.

Thus, for the foregoing reasons, the Applicant believes that Claim 11 contains patentable

subject matter. Consequently, Claim 11 and its associated dependent claims should be allowed.

With regard to independent Claim 20, the Examiner states:

> Regarding claim 20, Examiner once again respectfully believes Ludwig
> teaches the method of graphically viewing and participating in one or more
> conference calls comprising selecting participants for one or more conference
> calls by way of pointing, clicking, and dragging participants identifiers into one
> ore more conference identifiers. As explained above for claim 7, Ludwig explains
> there can be multiple ongoing conference calls which can be manipulated. As far
> as the dragging participants identifiers into one or more conference indentifiers
> [sic], was also taught above. Ludwig discloses the first way is to add one or more
> parties to an existing two-party call. For this purpose, an Add button is provided
> by both the collaboration Initiator and the Rolodex, as illustrated in Figs. 2A and
> 22. To add a new party a user selects the party to be added (by clicking on the
> user's rolodex name or face icon as described above); Column 24 line 39-46. This
> shows to the examiner that a participant via pointing and clicking of a rolodex is
> added to an existing conference call which is considered a conference
> identifier(fig 38 element 203,230, 234).

Claim 20 recites "A method of graphically viewing and participating in one or more

conference calls comprising selecting participants for one or more conference calls by way of

pointing, clicking, and dragging participant identifiers into one or more conference identifiers."

As he states the "Examiner once again respectfully believes Ludwig teaches the method of

graphically viewing and participating in one or more conference calls comprising selecting

participants for one or more conference calls by way of pointing, clicking, and dragging participants identifiers into one ore more conference identifiers." However, the Examiner has provided his interpretation and/or characterization of what is disclosed in Ludwig, in an attempt to show a teaching of what is recited in Claim 20. Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner's characterization. Applicant requests the Examiner to refer to Applicant's arguments concerning Claim 11 with regard to the term "conference identifiers." While the Examiner states that "Ludwig discloses the first way is to add one or more parties to an existing two-party call," Applicant respectfully submits that the method of adding a participant using an Add button (as disclosed in Figure 2A of Ludwig) is different from "pointing, clicking, and dragging participant identifiers into one or more conference identifiers," as recited in Claim 20. Likewise, the Examiner's statement that "to add a new party a user selects the party to be added (by clicking on the user's rolodex name or face icon as described above)," does not show a teaching of "selecting participants for one or more conference calls by way of pointing, clicking, and dragging participant identifiers into one or more conference identifiers," as recited in Claim 20. Again, the Examiner has characterized what is disclosed in Ludwig, in an attempt to show a teaching of what is recited in Claim 20. The Examiner is asked to review paragraph [34] of the Specification to gain an understanding of the term "conference identifier," as recited in Claim 20. Thus, for at least these reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not shown a teaching of what is recited in independent Claim 20. Therefore, Applicant believes Claim 20 contains patentable subject matter, which should be passed to allowance. Applicants request allowance of independent Claim 20 and its associated dependent claims.

With regard to independent Claim 1, the Examiner states:

13

Regarding claim 1, Ludwig for example, during a call, a call request from another party could arrive. This arrival could be signaled to the user by providing an alert indication in a dialog box on the user's CMW screen; Column 23 line 11-14. The CMW screen and it's [sic] functionality is based on interaction with servers. Ludwig discloses for example, to provide multi-party teleconferencing, an initiating CMW 12 signals MLAN Server 60 via Data LAN hub 25 identifying the desired conference participants; Column 8 line 66-69)

Claim 1 recites "A system for configuring a conference call comprising a computing device that is communicatively coupled with a server, said computing device capable of displaying, to a participant of a conference call, information regarding a status of the conference call based on at least one communication received from said server." The Examiner alleges that "a call request from another party could arrive. This arrival could be signaled to the user by providing an alert indication in a dialog box on the user's CMW screen." The Examiner refers the Applicant to Column 23, lines 11-14, which state:

> After a call has been set up, AVNM clients can send requests to the AVNM to change the state of the call, which can advantageously be accomplished by controlling the callhandle states. For example, during a call, a call request from another party could arrive.

The preceding passage does not teach "a system for configuring a conference call comprising a computing device that is communicatively coupled with a server, said computing device capable *of displaying, to a participant of a conference call, information regarding a status of the conference call* based on at least one communication received from said server," as recited in Claim 1 (emphasis denoted in italics).

14

Furthermore, the Examiner states that "The CMW screen and it's [sic] functionality is based on interaction with servers. Ludwig discloses for example, to provide multi-party teleconferencing, an initiating CMW 12 signals MLAN Server 60 via Data LAN hub 25 identifying the desired conference participants." (Ludwig, Col. 8, lines 66-69 [sic]).

The Applicant respectfully submits that the preceding passage does not disclose displaying information regarding a status of a conference call based on at least one communication received from said server, as recited in Claim 1. Instead, this passage discloses a CMW 12 that signals an MLAN server 60. The Applicant respectfully submits that "a CMW 12 that *signals* an MLAN server 60" is different from what is recited in Claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action does not show a teaching of what is recited in independent Claim 1. Thus, Applicant believes that Claim 1 contains patentable subject matter, which should be passed to allowance. Applicant requests allowance of independent Claim 1 and its associated dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant believes that Claims 1-26 are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited. Should anything remain in order to place the present Application in condition for allowance, or should the Examiner disagree or have any question regarding this submission, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned at (312) 775-8246.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to the Deposit Account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd., Account No. 13-0017.

Dated: January 28, 2008   Respectfully submitted,

                                      _____/Roy B. Rhee/_____
                                      Roy B. Rhee
                                      Reg. No. 57,303

                                      McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
                                      500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
                                      Chicago, Illinois 60661-2565
                                      Telephone: (312) 775-8246
                                      Facsimile: (312) 775-8100